Plato and the First Principles of Grammar

Saturday, July 30, 2022

The metaphors of the Bible maybe too difficult for a reader to comprehend: And so, if one were intent on learning judgment, it is written in the Bible, that one should seek unto the living and unto the dead, and if they do not seek God in this fashion, it is because there is no light in them. This is because as written there would be imposed on man, the time Adam sleeps, also called the Famine of the Word. And what you learn from the following, the restart of hearing the word of God, is aided by the works of Plato, God's path has been in preparation.

Thus, one can get a better grasp of the first principles of Judgment from Plato, but again, not if one is a bit too slow for him.

Plato is so important, I made a compendium of various translations of his work so that one might see what Plato meant by first principles, what we call pattern recognition, and by the word dialectic and dialectician, what we call today binary recursion, what God is as the whole Universe, and what it means to be in the image of God, i.e. intelligence to turn the perceptible into the intelligible. With functional intelligence a mind can mirror the perceptible in the intelligible.

> Socrates:: Now I myself, Phaedrus, am a lover of these processes of division and bringing together, as aids to speech and thought; and if I think any other man is able to see things that can naturally be collected into one and divided into many, him I follow after and walk in his footsteps as if he were a god. And whether the name I give to those who can do this is right or wrong, God knows, but I have called them hitherto dialecticians. But tell me now what name to give to those who are taught by you and Lysias, or is this that art of speech by means of which Thrasymachus and the rest have become able speakers themselves, and make others so, if they are willing to pay them royal tribute? Translated by H. N. Fowler
>
> Socrates:: For my part, Phædrus, I am not only myself a lover of these divisions and generalizations, in order that I may be able both to speak and think; but if I perceive any one else able to comprehend the one and the many, as they are in nature, him "I follow behind as in the footsteps of a god." But whether I designate those who are able to do this, rightly or not, God knows, however I have hitherto called them dialecticians. But now, tell me by what name ought we to call those who take lessons from you and Lysias? is this that art of speaking, by the use of which Thrasymachus and others have become able speakers themselves, and make others so who are willing to bring presents to them, as to kings? Translated by Henry Cary
>
> Socrates:: Believe me, Phaedrus, I am myself a lover of these divisions and collections, that I may gain the power to speak and to think, and whenever I deem another man able to discern an objective unity and plurality, I follow 'in his footsteps where he leadeth as a god.' Furthermore—whether I am right or wrong in doing so, God alone knows—it is those that have this ability whom for the present I call dialecticians. Translated by R. Hackforth
>
> Socrates:: I am myself a great lover of these processes of division and generalization; they help me to speak and to think. And if I find any man

who is able to see 'a One and Many' in nature, him I follow, and 'walk in his footsteps as if he were a god.' And those who have this art, I have hitherto been in the habit of calling dialecticians; but God knows whether the name is right or not. And I should like to know what name you would give to your or to Lysias' disciples, and whether this may not be that famous art of rhetoric which Thrasymachus and others teach and practice? Skilful speakers they are, and impart their skill to any who is willing to make kings of them and to bring gifts to them. Translated by Jowett 3rd ed

Socrates:: Well, Phaedrus, I am myself a lover of these divisions and collections, so that I may be able to think and to speak; and if I believe that someone else is capable of discerning a single thing that is also by nature capable of encompassing many, I follow "straight behind, in his tracks, as if he were a god." God knows whether this is the right name for those who can do this correctly or not, but so far I have always called them "dialecticians." But tell me what I must call them now that we have learned all this from Lysias and you. Or is it just that art of speaking that Thrasymachus and the rest of them use, which has made them masters of speechmaking and capable of producing others like them—anyhow those who are willing to bring them gifts and to treat them as if they were kings? Translated by Alexander Nehamas and Paul Woodruff

Socrates:: But I, O Phædrus, am a lover of such divisions and compositions as may enable me both to speak and understand. And if I think that any other is able to behold the one and the many, according to the nature of things, this man I follow, pursuing his footsteps as if he were a God. But whether or not I properly denominate those who are able to accomplish this, Divinity knows. But I have hitherto called them men conversant with dialectic. Tell me, therefore, by what name it is proper to call them, according to your opinion and that of Lysias. Or is this that art of speaking, which Thrasymachus and others employing, became themselves wise in oratory, and rendered others such, who were willing to bestow gifts on them, as if they had been kings? Translated by Thomas Taylor

Socrates:: Now, not only do I pursue myself, with all a lovers assiduity, these methods of decomposing and combining, but if ever I find any one else whom I judge capable of apprehending the one and the many as they are in nature, that man I follow behind, as though in the track of a god. And to all who are possessed of this power I have been in the habit of giving, whether rightly or wrongly, heaven knows, the name of dialecticians. But tell me, what is the proper name for the disciples of your school and Lysias's? is yours that identical art of words by the use of which Thrasymachus and his compeers have not only become clever speakers themselves, but make such of all their pupils, who are willing to bring them presents, as though they were kings? Translated by J. Wright

One other thing Plato is setting up in this passage is a distinction between Sophistry and Philosophy, and if you follow that out, it resolves to a distinction between false prophets and the true Prophets of God. This one passage of Plato's gives one a pretty hefty idea of how to understand the metaphors of the Bible. And when they do, then they might suspect that the pair, Socrates and Plato, were actually two prophets even by Biblical definition. And when you understand the metaphors of the Bible you deduce:

Adam and Eve are a Conjugate Binary Pair, whereby Complete Induction and Deduction produces the life of man, in body, mind, and soul.

If you still don't see it, let me go even more slowly by examining man, himself, after all, if man is in the image of God, than we can examine that image and learn the same thing.

Our body senses the environment, affording an analog data stream for the mind. The first step is pre-parsing, or what can be called sifting, ignoring the noise and sending the rest to memory forming the virtualization of perception but still analog information. This analog is also called a relative or verb.

Virtualized perception, called memory, can be recursively parsed, and a famous metaphor, chewing the cud. Parsing is the application of limits to the relative. Now the limit imposed is not the relative nor is the relative information the limit. Just like you find in Geometry, the point is that which has no part. A noun is not a verb and a verb is not a noun.

The limit is called a correlative or noun. One might also see the metaphor, living, dead, born again. Etc.

This off, on, off is also called a unit, a thing, and the definition of a thing goes, A thing is a relative constrained by correlatives. Or again, A thing is the combination of a noun and a verb.

Thus, recursion of the unit is called a definition, a grouping of names, Noun = noun and verb. So we see, dialectic is just another name for binary recursion as exampled by the computer today.

If we now take this binary and use it to distinguish how many systems of grammar it affords mankind, i.e. how the mind can guide the hand, and how the hand can teach the mind. We take as absolute the method of writing symbol sets, and as the relative the method by which these symbols can be recursively applied for a grammar. This gives us a Grammar Matrix, by which the perceptible can be born again, in the mind as the intelligible: Common Grammar (as noun and verb), Arithmetic (as 0 and 1), Algebra (the combination of both arithmetic and common grammar) and Geometry (point and line).

Plato tried to prove this and had geometers trying to figure it out, but failed. I show a fuller view of the power of binary recursion in geometry.

The second part of using binary recursion is that it produces only two types of identity with the name pairs of arithmetic and geometric, literal and metaphorical, etc. Each of the four grammars in our grammar matrix do so under these two identities.

A word pair which should help you understand information processing is that a unit, a thing, is also a standard of behavior, i.e. all information processing is to discover and log all standards of behavior in order to do the job we are being made for, dominion over the whole

environment to tend the Garden of Life. Standard is to noun, i.e. parsing, as behavior is to the relative, verb, behavior. Judgment is a method of learning the consequences of behavior, or again, behavioral management and why it evolves into the only just form of government written of in the Bible, Nomocracy.

One should also understand, that our Grammar Matrix, is for managing every thing by the verb, behavior, and with it, even mankind can be divided between the Children of God, or just another stupid animal. Those who can only use the noun, but in which is no understanding, and those that function by managing the verb, the metaphorical.

A whole lot of people claim to love God, and to love Truth, but as the mind is responsible for the production of all human behavior, it is written, like that old song; There is No Hiding Place Down Here.

The word Kosher, does not mean the perceptible, what your body eats, it means standing on the binary, cloven, and parsing the information to learn judgment, another metaphor saying to write law on the head and hand: We are the intelligible, not the perceptible, and the intelligible is the virtualization of the perceptible afforded by our Grammar Matrix, i.e. the image of God, by which, information, and ourselves, are born again.

As children of God, prophecy is, as written even in Genesis and the principles of grammar, predictive behavior, and in another pretty metaphor, The Testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of Prophecy, who can possibly believe that anyone can do the work we are being made for is anything else, but a stupid animal.

In the metaphors of the Bible and Plato: Psychology is commensurate with the ability to turn the Intelligible of Language into our Grammar Matrix, which affords a mind the ability to turn the perceptible into the intelligible so as to form judgment in truth.

Psychology is not the sophistic gibberish of crackpots today.

What the Bible and the Dialogs of Plato show is that many people can translate them fairly by only being literal thinkers, yet even to this day, no one has had the intelligence to understand, or display the intelligible.

So if there is, only One God one can count on and count with, does it make any sense to claim that you can choose which one the one is? In the Noun, which is asserted by intelligence, the verb?

And, as written, Judgment Day, is the day that mankind leaves his father and cleaves unto his wife and become tenders of the Garden of Live, just like any other children.